



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Of the numerous recent studies in Greek word-formation among the most important are E. Fraenkel's *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis auf τῆρ, -τωρ, -της (-τ-)*, erster Teil (Strassburg, 1910) and W. Petersen's *Greek Diminutives in -ιωρ*, a study in semantics (Weimar, 1910: see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.197-198). We may mention also *Studies in Greek Noun-formation*, edited by C. D. Buck (Chicago, 1910-), the first instalments of which are appearing in *Classical Philology* (*Labial Terminations*, by E. H. Sturtevant, 5.324-356, 6.197-215, 450-476, 7.420-441).

F. Solmsen's *Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung*, I (Strassburg, 1909), contains numerous contributions on word-formation, etymology, and the dialects (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.131-132). There is ground for hope that the projected continuation of the work was near enough to completion at the time of the author's death so that it may be published.

E. Nachmanson, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der altgriechischen Volkssprache* (Upsala, 1910), shows that many supposed blunders of the ancient engravers really represent popular mispronunciations. Some of his conclusions, however, are improbable.

A. Thumb's *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg, 1909) and C. D. Buck's *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects*, *Grammar*, *Selected Inscriptions*, *Glossary* (Boston, 1910) are both excellent, and in many respects they supplement each other (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.237-238). For beginners Buck's *Introduction* is the more serviceable.

F. Bechtel's *Aeolica, Bemerkungen zur Kritik und Sprache der äolischen Inschriften* (Halle, 1909) is valuable. J. Brause's *Lautlehre der kretischen Dialekte* (Halle, 1909) will have to be reckoned with in all future work on the Cretan dialects. Numbers 6, 7, 9, and 10 of Meister's *Beiträge zur griechischen Epigraphik und Dialektologie* (in *Berichte der sächsischen Gesellschaft*, 1908-1911) are devoted to Cyprian inscriptions. Number 8 (1910) is entitled *Synoikievertrag aus dem arkadischen Orchomenos*; number 11 (1911) discusses *Das Urteil von Mantinea*. Meister interprets the oldest known Cyprian inscription in *Abhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft* 27.9 (1909).

F. Stolz's *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Sammlung Göschen, 1910) is far inferior to Hoffmann's companion volume on the Greek language. The best history of the Latin language is F. Skutsch's article, *Die lateinische Sprache*, in Hinneberg's *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*<sup>3</sup> II. VII (Leipzig, 1912), to which Stolz owes rather more than he acknowledges. Dependence upon other handbooks is a striking feature also of Stolz's *Laut- und Formenlehre* in the fourth edition of the *Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik* (München, 1910). The work is nevertheless valuable on account of the extensive citations of

technical literature (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.164).

Holzweissig's revision of Kühner's *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, volume I (Hanover, 1912), is so far from bringing the treatment up to date on either the linguistic or the philological side that it may safely be ignored.

The second edition of A. Walde's *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1910) shows an increase in bulk from xlvii + 870 pp. to xxi + 1044. It is the best etymological dictionary at present available for any of the older Indo-European languages.

A. Ernout, in his dissertation, *Les éléments dialectaux du vocabulaire Latin* (Paris, 1909), discusses the reasons why the Romans borrowed words from the other Italic dialects and the means we have of detecting such borrowing, and he gives a surprisingly extensive list of loan words.

W. A. Merrill's *On the Contracted Genitive in -i* in Latin (Berkeley, Cal., 1910) contains extensive collections of material, but the conclusions are worthless because of the author's imperfect mastery of the method of linguistic science.

Albert Hehl's dissertation, *Die Formen der lateinischen ersten Deklination in den Inschriften* (Tübingen, 1912) contains contributions to our knowledge of popular Latin. Some of the materials for that subject are easily accessible in Diehl's *Vulgärlateinische Inschriften* (Bonn, 1910) and *Pompeianische Wandinschriften und Verwandtes* (Bonn, 1910). Equally useful is his *Altlateinische Inschriften* (Bonn, 1909).

W. Meyer-Lübke's *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1911-) is to be arranged on virtually the same convenient plan as Körting's *Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch*, and will supersede the latter work.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

## REVIEWS

Q. Horati Flacci *Satirae*. *Satires publiés par Paul Lejay*. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie (1911). Pp. cxxviii + 623. Fr. 15.

In this edition we have one of those comprehensive works which are characteristic of French scholarship. Perhaps no edition of the *Satires* in any language contains so much material between two covers. It is a critical edition, with an exhaustive commentary, and with preliminary essays on practically every question connected with the subject. Besides these, each satire has a special introduction of considerable fullness.

In the Introduction, among other topics, there is an interesting discussion of the relation of Satire to the Old Comedy, as well as of the origin of Satire. In the latter M. Lejay examines and rejects the theories of Leo, Marx, and Hendrickson.

Fifteen pages are devoted to the manuscripts. In the Apparatus Criticus the readings of Cruquius are given with more fulness and treated with more respect than by Keller or by Vollmer. It is of course out of the question to discuss all the variant readings and moot points of interpretation in the Satires. I must confine myself to a few topics, and, since in the greater number of these I differ from M. Lejay, it should be said in advance that the book is characterized by sound and thorough scholarship, and that it is indispensable to all serious students of the Satires.

The condition of the text of Horace is such that new readings seldom meet with general acceptance. The only exception seems to be Samuelsson's *ultra* "non" "*etiam*" *sileas*, in 2.5.90-91. Both Vollmer and Lejay accept this, the former without credit. It is true that it involves no change in the words of the text, but it gives an entirely new meaning and disposes of a syntactical difficulty.

A somewhat similar change, since it is a mere question of the division of words, was suggested in 1903 by M. Lejay in the *Mélanges Boissier*, and is now taken into his text. This is *ab normis sapiens* for *abnormis sapiens* in 2.2.3. M. Lejay argues that *abnormis* is a late word, since it is elsewhere found only in glosses, where it is defined by *ἀνὸρμος* and *innumerabilis*. He holds also that *sapiens* as a substantive, which it must be with the reading *abnormis sapiens*, is not modified by an adjective in Horace, or probably in any other ancient writer.

While these objections are entitled to some weight, *abnormis* is perfectly regular in its formation, and it is accepted by Thurneysen (*Thesaurus*, s.v.), who marks its use in Horace with "*translate*". Furthermore, Horace uses adjective modifiers with other substantives formed from adjectives; note for example, *avidos aegros*, 1.4.126.

Moreover, the objections against *ab normis sapiens* are far stronger than any which can be urged against the current reading. In the first place, Horace has no other case of *ab* before a consonant in the Satires, while he has eighteen of *a*, and only one in the Epistles, *ab Iove*, 1.12.3, a formula which is used even by writers who show almost absolute regularity in using *ab* only before vowels and *h*, such as Ovid and Quintilian, for example (see *Harvard Studies* 12.253). *Ab* before *n* is particularly rare in the classical poets, being used only by Lucretius, who has five or six cases (*Archiv* 11.250). The well-known influence of Lucretius on Horace could hardly be urged here, unless the former actually had the phrase *ab normis*.

If there be any in this day and generation who regard this as a trivial matter, as Bentley did (on *Epod.* 17.24), one may reply that *ab normis* is even more open to question on syntactical grounds. *Ab* with the ablative with adjectives is confined to those implying or denoting separation, motion from, freedom from, and the like (*Thesaurus* 1.14.66 ff.), including *tutus* and words of similar meaning (32.49 ff.), ex-

cept when it is equivalent to an ablative of respect (35.3 ff.). Its use with an adjective like *sapiens* in the sense of "en dehors de" is quite unparalleled. It is certainly safer to assume that *abnormis* is one of Horace's comparatively rare coinages than to substitute a phrase so contrary to the formal and syntactical usage of *ab* as *ab normis*.

In the two passages from Cicero cited in favor of *ab normis* we have the singular *ad normam*, and not the plural *ad normas*, while the passage from Seneca does not contain *norma* at all. Moreover, Cicero de Amic. 18 is as pertinent for *abnormis* as for *ab normis*, and is in fact cited by those who read the former.

In 2.5.36 the reading *quassa nuce* for *cassa nuce* seems dubious, in spite of the unanimity of the manuscripts for the former. M. Lejay's citations merely show that *quassa* may mean 'broken'. *Quassa nux* nowhere occurs, and the assumption of a second proverbial expression so like *cassa nux* seems forced. Keller's derivation of *quassa* from *quatio* is of course more than doubtful, but possibly the form *cassa* may have been changed to *quassa* by popular etymology. The form *cassa* seems preferable, and, if *quassa* be read, it is best taken as a variant of *cassa*.

In 2.2.38 Lejay may be right in taking *raro* with *temnit*, but the change to *rare* has little to commend it.

Changes in punctuation are more frequent. As an example may be cited 1.1.23, where M. Lejay reads *ne sic, ut qui iocularia ridens, percurram*. The construction *iocularia ridens* seems well enough attested, but when we examine Cic. De Orat. 2.328, which he cites as an example of the absolute use of *percurro*, we find, as is so often the case with so-called parallel passages, that a fuller quotation suggests a different interpretation. Cicero's words are as follows: *et est et probabilius quod gestum esse dicas, cum quem ad modum actum sit exponas, et multo apertius ad intellegendum est si constituitur aliquando ac non ista brevitate percurritur*. If we note the italicized words, it is much more natural to take the antecedent of *quod* as the subject of *percurritur*.

In spite of these criticisms, the reviewer much more frequently finds himself in accord with M. Lejay than at variance with him.

The following misprints may be noted: *incipit* (1.5.18) and the omission of the commas before and after *boni* in 2.2.1, where the commentary shows that the word is taken as a vocative. It is to be regretted that the very fulness of the commentary made it necessary to use excessively small type, which cannot be read continuously without tiring the eyes.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans. By Franz Cumont. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1912). \$2.00.